Serial No. 10/519,587
Amdt. dated August 28, 2008
Reply to Office Action dated March 28, 2006

PATENT
PD020057
Customer No. 24498

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 2 8 2008

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In order to more clearly define the invention, and to avoid excessive amendatory matter, all of the pending claims have been cancelled, and replaced by new Claims 17 to 30. The Applicant believes that this submission fully complies with 37 CFR 1.121.

The Examiner has rejected all Claims under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article by Lea et al in view of US patent 6,963,783, to Bi et al. The Examiner is requested to reconsider the invention as defined by newly submitted Claims 17 to 30, together with the following argument.

Lea et al relates to a home network of a HAVi type, in which a sink device has the capability to control a source device. Nowhere does Lea et al show or suggest:

"means .... for automatically establishing, upon selection of a function of the source by the user through the user interface, a connection between the data source device and the data sink device",

as specifically recited in newly submitted Claim 17. Rather, Lea et al discloses, on page 42, left column, line 23 et seq, that a local stream manager can set up or tear down isochronous connections between different devices. A user can turn on and turn off data flow. However, nowhere does Lea et al automatically establish a connection with a sink device upon selection of a source device. It is therefore clear that Lea et al does not affect the patentability of newly submitted Claim 17.

Bi et al relates to a system for wireless communication between a computer and wireless interface devices. Bi et al automatically connects a wireless interface to the last host computer to which it was connected. However, the user must initially select a host. Nowhere does Bi et al show or suggest:

"means .... for automatically establishing, upon selection of a function of the source by the user through the user interface, a connection between the data source device and the data sink device",

as specifically recited in newly submitted Claim 17. It is therefore clear that the patentability of newly submitted Claim 17 is not affected by either Lea et al or Bi et al, taken either singly or in combination.

Similarly, nowhere do either Lea et al or Bi et al show or suggest:

5

Serial No. 10/519,587
Amdt. dated August 28, 2008
Reply to Office Action dated March 28, 2008

PATENT
PD020057
Customer No. 24498

"automatically establishing a connection for data transmission from the source device to the sink device upon selection of a function of said source device by a user",

as specifically recited in Claim 25. It is therefore clear that neither Lea et al nor Bi et al affect the patentability of Claim 25.

Newly submitted Claims 18 to 24 are dependent from Claim 17, and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 17.

Similarly, newly submitted Claims 26 to 30 are dependent from Claim 25, and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 25.

The Applicant submits that the instant application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Weber

August 28, 2008
Date

By: Daniel E. Sragow
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 22,856
609/734-6832

THOMSON LICENSING LLC
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543

6